

Re: The Rotating Disk

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-08/msg02512.html>

- *From:* "Sorcerer" <Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 30 Aug 2006 14:49:25 GMT
-

<e_erpelding@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1156943782.639946.186930@xx
| You are the one that does not want to discuss the issue, by only giving
| a link to a web page and then starting (somewhat early I might say)
| with the insults.

The issue is that you attempted to use a crackpot childish theory to claim the fiction of your Dr. Who machine had a basis in reality, and it doesn't.

|
| The question is, Are there certain non-inertial reference frames such
| that a bounded region of space is physically larger than as seen from
| an inertial (at rest) frame.

NO, there are NOT.

|
| But perhaps you do not understand the rotating disk from a relativistic
| standpoint?

I understand Einstein's relativity, it is a fiction like your time machine. You do NOT understand that the cuckoo transformations CANNOT be derived mathematically. You are pissed off because I call Einstein a shithead, but refuse to discuss the mathematics because
a) you do not understand mathematics,
b) you are childish.

| It is an important example in relativity theory, Landau and Lifshitz
| even start their chapter on gravitation in their book, The Classical
| Theory of Fields, using it as a basic example of a non-inertial
| reference system.
|

Non sequitur, I've shown that the cuckoo transformations

Re: The Rotating Disk

are fiction, I don't give a shit what Landau and Lifshitz have to say.

| This group, sci.physics.relativity, is the appropriate place to discuss
| the subject.

Yes, but you refused to examine my page because of your prejudice, and I'm not swallowing your childish shit about a Tardis.

Androcles